

THE
MONTHLY JOURNAL.

VOL. IV.]

BOSTON, SEPTEMBER, 1863.

[No. 9.]

ESSAYS ON THE TRUTHS AND ERRORS OF
ORTHODOXY.

ESSAY IX., AND LAST.

The Trinity. — Athanasian Creed.

THE *Church doctrine* concerning the Trinity appears most fully developed in its Orthodox form in what is called the CREED OF ST. ATHANASIUS. It was not written by him, but by some one in the fifth or sixth century.

1. Whosoever will be saved, before all things must take care to keep the Catholic faith:

2. Which except one keeps it entire and inviolate, he shall without doubt perish everlastingly.

3. But the Catholic faith is this: that we adore one God in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity;

4. Neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance.

5. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Spirit.

6. But the Divinity of the Father, Son, and Spirit, is one, the glory equal, the majesty equal.

7. As is the Father, so is the Son, and so is the Holy Spirit.

8. The Father is uncreated, the Son is uncreated, and the Holy Spirit uncreated.

9. The Father immeasurable, the Son immeasurable, and the Holy Spirit immeasurable.

10. The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Spirit eternal.

11. And yet there are not three Eternals, but one Eternal.

12. And so there are not *three* uncreated, nor *three* immeasurable, but *one* uncreated, and one immeasurable.

13. So the Father is omnipotent, the Son is omnipotent, and the Holy Spirit is omnipotent.

14. And yet there are not *three* omnipotents, but *one* omnipotent.

15. So the Father is God; the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God.

16. And yet there are not *three* Gods, but *one* God.

17. So the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Spirit is Lord.

18. And yet there are not *three* Lords, but *one* Lord.

19. For as we are compelled by Christian truth to confess of each one, that each person is God and Lord; so we are forbidden by the Catholic religion from saying three Gods or three Lords.

20. The Father is not made, nor created, nor begotten.

21. The Son is from the Father alone; not made, nor created, *but begotten*.

22. The Holy Spirit is from the Son and the Father; not created, nor begotten, but *proceeding*.

23. Therefore there is one Father, and not three; one Son, and not three; one Holy Spirit, and not three.

24. And in this Trinity there is none before or after, none greater or less, but all three Persons are co-eternal and co-equal.

25. So that everywhere we must adore the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity.

26. Whoever, therefore, would be saved, must think thus of the Trinity.

The Orthodox Doctrine of the Trinity.

Is there any substantial truth in the doctrine of the Trinity?

The fact that so many nations of the world, outside of Christianity, have believed in some kind of Trinity, or, at any rate, some kind of Triad, would lead us to believe that there is a foundation for it in the nature of things. We find such a Triad in the systems of religion originating in India, Persia, Egypt, Scandinavia; also in Buddhism and in Platonism. In the Christian Church, the history of this doctrine is interesting and important. Some sort of Triad, or Trinity, existed in very early times, although the Orthodox form was not established until later.

At first, the prevailing doctrine is that of SUBORDINATION; that is, that the Son and the Spirit are inferior to the Father. But, as the Son and the Spirit were also called divine, those who thought thus were accused of believing in three Gods. Some then said, that the FATHER was alone divine; and these were called Monarchians. Others, wishing to retain the divinity of the Son and Spirit, and yet to believe in one God, said that the *divinity* in the Father, in the Son, and in the Spirit, was essentially the same, but that the divinity of the Father was the fountain from which that of the Son and Spirit was derived. This was fixed as Orthodox at the Council of Nice, A.D. 325; and was the beginning of Orthodoxy in the Church. It was a middle course between Scylla and Charybdis, which were represented on the one side by ARIUS, who maintained that the Son was created out of nothing; and by SABELLIUS on the other hand, who maintained that the Son was only a mode, manifestation, or name of God: God being called the Father, as Creator of the world; called Son, as Redeemer of the world; and

Spirit, as Sanctifier of the world. The Council of Nice declared that the Son was not a manifestation of God, as Sabellius said; nor a creation by God, as Arius said; but a derivation from God.* Just as the essence of the fountain flows into the stream derived from it, so the essence of the Father flows into the Son, who is derived from him. Here, then, we have the three formulas of the early Church,—that of **ARIUS**, who says, “The Son was created by the Father, and is inferior to him; that of **SABELLIUS**, who says, “The Father, Son, and Spirit are manifestations of God, and the same essence;” and **ORTHODOXY**, as the Council of Nice, trying to stand between them, and saying, “The Son is derived from the Father, and is of the same essence with him.”

The Church, ever since, has been like a ship beating against head winds between opposing shores. It has stood on one tack to avoid Arianism or Tritheism, till it finds itself running into Sabellianism; then it goes about, and stands away till it comes near Arianism or Tritheism

* The decrees of the Council of Nice inclined to Sabellianism. The term *ὁμοούσιος* (*of the same essence*) was a Sabellian term. Sabellianism could, in fact, stand most of the tests of modern Orthodoxy, since it maintains *three persons and one essence*, *μίαν ὑπόστασιν* and *τρία πρόσωπα*; and **SCHLEIERMACHER**, in one of his most elaborate treatises (*Ueber den Gegensatz zwischen der Sabellianischen und der Athanasianischen Vorstellung von der Trinitat. Theolog. Zeitschrift. Berlin, 1822*), has sought to rehabilitate Sabellianism. **MOSES STUART** translated this treatise, and plainly advocated a similar view. **HASE** (*Kirchengeschichte*, § 91) defines the view of Sabellius as making “Father, Son, and Spirit the different forms of revelation of the Supreme Unity unfolding itself in the world-history as the Triad.” Perhaps (see “**Baur**”) the chief peculiarity of Sabellius is in making the Triad begin and end with the process of revelation. The Monad is God in himself: the Triad is God in the process of self-revelation (**BAUR**, “*Christliche Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit*,” and “*Lehrbuch der Christlichen Dogmengeschichte*”).

again. Unitarianism is on both sides : on one side in the form of one God, with a threefold manifestation of himself ; on the other side in the form of a Supreme God, with the Son and Spirit subordinate. It has always been very hard to be Orthodox ; for, to do so, one must distinguish the Persons, and yet not divide the substance, of the Deity. In keeping the three Persons distinctly separate, there was great danger of making three distinct Gods. On the other hand, if one tried to make the Unity distinct, there was danger that the Persons would grow shadowy, and disappear.

The heaviest charge against the Church doctrine of the Trinity is, that, driven to despair by these difficulties, it has at last made Orthodoxy consist, not in any sound belief, but only in sound phrases. It is not believing any thing, but saying something, which now makes a man Orthodox. If you will only use the *word* "Trinity" in any sense, if you will only call Christ God in any sense, you are Orthodox.

The errors in the popular view concerning the Trinity, as it is at present held, seem to me to be these : —

1. *The Trinity is held as a mere dogma*, or form of words, not as a reality. It is held in the letter, not in the spirit. There is no power in it, nor life in it ; and it is in no sense an object of faith to those who accept it. They do not believe it, but rather believe that they ought to believe it. There are certain texts in Scripture which seem to assert it, certain elaborate arguments which appear convincing and irrefutable. On the strength of these texts and these arguments, they believe that they ought to believe it. But it is a matter of conscience, not of heart ; of logic, not of life ; of law, not of love. It is not held as a Christian doctrine ought to be held, with the heart ; but only philosophically, with the head. If it should cease to

be preached for a few years in Orthodox pulpits, it would cease to be believed; it would drop out of the faith, or rather out of the creed, of the community. Unitarianism has extended itself, without being preached, from the simple reading of the Bible. But Trinitarianism cannot be trusted to its own power. It has no hold on the heart. Here, in Massachusetts, the ministers left off preaching the Trinity; and the consequence was, that the people became Unitarian. Unitarianism in New England was not diffused by preaching: it came of itself, as soon as the clergy left off preaching the Trinity. This shows how worthless, empty, and soulless the doctrine was and is. Instead of this formal doctrine, we want something vital.

2. *Another objection to the present form of the Trinity is, that it is not only scholastic, or purely intellectual, but that it is also negative.* It is not even a positive doctrine. It is often charged against Unitarianism, that it is a mere negation; and, in one sense, the charge is well founded. Unitarianism is a negation, so far as it is a mere piece of reasoning against Orthodoxy; but, as asserting the Divine Unity, it is very positive. But the doctrine of the Trinity is a mere negation, as it is usually held; because it is an empty form of denial. It only can be defined or expressed negatively. The three Persons are not substances, on the one hand; nor qualities, on the other hand. It is not Sabellianism, nor is it Arianism. Every term connected with the Trinity has been selected, not to express a truth, but to avoid an error. The term "one essence" was chosen in order to exclude Arianism: the term "three Persons," or subsistences, was chosen in order to avoid Sabellianism.

Because the doctrine is thus a negation, it has failed of its chief use. It has become exclusive; whereas, when stated truly, as a positive truth, it would become inclusive.

Truly stated, it would bind together all true religion in one harmonious whole, comprehending in its universal sweep every thing true in natural religion, every thing true in reason, and uniting them in vital union, without discord and without confusion. Every manifestation which God has made of himself in nature, in Christ, and in the human soul, would be accepted and vitally recognized by Christianity, which comes, not to destroy, but to fulfil. The doctrine of the Trinity would be the highest form of reconciliation or atonement, — reconciling all varieties in one great harmony; reconciling the natural and supernatural, law and grace, time and eternity, fate and freedom.

But, before illustrating this, we must consider further some of the objections to the common form of the doctrine.

It is also charged against the doctrine of the Trinity, “that it is a contradiction in terms, and therefore essentially incredible.” To this it is replied, that it would be a contradiction if God were called Three *in the same sense* in which he is called One; but not otherwise. The answer is perfectly satisfactory; and we therefore proceed to ask, In what sense is he called Three, and in what sense is he called One? The answer is, The Unity is of essence, or substance: the Trinity is of persons. This answer, again, is satisfactory, provided we know what is meant by these two terms. But the difficulty is to know what is meant by the word “person.” We are expressly informed, that this term is not used in its usual sense; for, if it were, it would divide the essence, and three Persons would be the same as three Gods. On the other hand, we are told that it means more than the three characters or manifestations. Here lies the difficulty, and the whole of the rational difficulty, in the doctrine of the Trinity. It is all

on the side of the Triad. When we ask, What do you mean by "the Three"? there can be given but three answers,—two of them distinct, and one indistinct. These answers are, (1.) We mean three *Somethings*, which we cannot define; (2.) We mean three Persons, like Peter, James, and John; (3.) We mean three manifestations, characters, or modes of being. Let us consider these three answers.

1. "The three Persons are three Somethings, which cannot be defined. It is a mystery. It is above reason. There is mystery in every thing, and there must be mystery in the Deity." So Augustine said, long ago, "We say three Persons, not because we have any thing to say, but because we want to say something." But if one uses the phrase "three Persons," and refuses to define it positively, merely defining it negatively, saying, "It does not mean this, and it does not mean that, and I don't know what it does mean," he avoids, it is true, the difficulties, and escapes the objections; but he does it by giving up the article of faith. No one can deny that there *may be* three unknown distinctions in the divine nature; but no one can be asked to believe in them, till he is told what they are. To say, therefore, that the Trinity is a mystery, is to abandon it as an article of faith, and make of it only a subject of speculation. We avoid the contradiction; but we do it by relinquishing the doctrine.

This fact is not sufficiently considered by Trinitarians. They first demand of us to believe the doctrine of the Trinity, and, when pressed to state distinctly the doctrine, retire into the protection of mystery, and decline giving any distinct account of it. Now, no human being ever denied the existence of mysteries connected with God and nature and all life. To assure us, therefore, that such mysteries exist, is slightly superfluous. But, on the other

hand, no human being ever believed, or could believe, a mystery, any more than he could see any thing invisible or hear any thing inaudible. To believe a doctrine, the first condition is that all its terms shall be distinct and intelligible.

2. The second answer to the question is, "We mean, by Persons, three Persons, like Peter, James, and John." According to this answer, the *Trinity* remains, but the *Unity* disappears. This answer leaves the Persons distinct, but the Unity indistinct. The Persons are not confounded; but the essence is divided. The Tri-personality is maintained, but at the expense of the Unity. In fact, this answer gives us Tritheism, or three Gods, whose unity is only an entire *agreement* of feeling and action. But this answer we may set aside as unorthodox, no less than unscriptural.

3. Having thus disposed of each other possible answer, there remains only that which makes of the three Persons three revelations or manifestations of God, or representations of God. This answer avoids all the difficulties. It avoids that of *contradiction*; as we do not say that God is one in the same sense in which he is three, but in a different sense. It avoids the objection of *obscurity*; for it is a distinct statement. It avoids the objection of Tritheism; for it leaves the Unity untouched. Moreover, it is a real Trinity, and not merely nominal. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are not merely three different names for the same thing; but they indicate three different revelations, three different views which God has given of his character, which, taken together, constitute the total divine representation. It remains, therefore, simply to ask, Is this view a *true one*? Is there any foundation for it in Scripture, in reason, and in Christian consciousness, the three sources of our knowledge of the truth?

We repeat, that this view is an Orthodox view of the Trinity, according to the teaching of the greatest fathers of the Church. If we suppose that the Deity has made, and is evermore making, three distinct and independent revelations of himself,—each revelation giving a different view of the Divine Being, each revelation showing God to man under a different aspect,—then each of these is a personal manifestation. Each reveals God as a Person. If we see God, for example, in nature, we see him not merely as a Power, a supreme Cause, but also a living Person, who creates evermore out of a fulness of divine wisdom and love. God in nature is, then, a Person. Again: if God reveals himself in Christ, it is not as abstract truth or as doctrinal statement. But we see God himself, the personal God, the Father and Friend, the Redeeming Grace, the God who loved us before the foundation of the world, approaching us in Christ to reconcile us and save us. It is a God who “so loved the world” that we see in Christ, therefore a Person; and so the Spirit, which speaks in the human conscience and human heart, is not a mere influence or rapture or movement, but is one who communes with us; one who talks with us; one who comforts us; one who hears and answers us; therefore a Person.

If, then, there is no antecedent objection to this form of the Trinity as a threefold manifestation of the Divine Being, we have only to ask, Is it *true* as a matter of fact? Has such a threefold manifestation of God actually taken place? We reply, that it is so. According to Scripture, observation, and experience, we find such to be the fact. Scripture shows us God, the Father, as the Source of all being, the Fountain and End of all things; from whom all things have come, and to whom all things tend. As the Creator, he reveals himself in nature and providence

(as the Apostle Paul declares); "being understood by the things that are made," and "not leaving himself without a witness."

Supreme Power, Wisdom, and Goodness are manifested in nature as unchanging Law, as perfect Order. But God is seen in Christ again as Redeemer, as meeting the exigencies arising from the freedom of the creature by what we call miracle; not contrary to nature, but different from nature, showing himself as the Friend and Helper of the soul. As the essence of the first revelation of God is the sight of his goodness and wisdom and power displayed in law, so the essence of the second revelation is of the same essential Being displaying himself as Love. In the first revelation, he is the universal Parent; in the second, he is the personal Friend. But there is a third revelation which God makes of himself,—within the soul as Life. The same Power, Wisdom, and Goodness which we see displayed externally in outward nature, we find manifested internally in the soul itself, as its natural and its spiritual life. That which is displayed outwardly as Power is manifested within the soul as Cause; that which is manifested outwardly as Wisdom is revealed inwardly as Reason; and that which is manifested outwardly as Goodness is manifested inwardly as Conscience, or the Law of Right.

The Scriptures also speak of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. When they speak of the Father, they usually mean God as the Supreme Being. Matt. xi. 25: "Jesus said, I thank thee, *O Father*, Lord of heaven and earth." As omniscient: "Of that day knoweth no man, nor the angels, nor the Son, but *the Father* only." As omnipotent: "Abba, *Father*, all things are possible to thee." As having life in himself, and as spirit: "They shall worship *the Father* in spirit and in truth." As the Source of all power, life, and authority of the Son: "I came forth of *the*

Father ;” “*the Father*, which hath sent me ;” “ the works which *the Father* hath given me to do.” The Apostle Paul says, “To us there is but *one God, the Father* ;” and calls him “the God of our Lord Jesus ;” also “the one God *and Father* of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all.” The great order of the universe depends on him : “ He has put the times and the seasons in his own power.” Christ will at last “deliver up the kingdom to God, *the Father*.” By Christ, “we have access in one spirit *to the Father*.” “All things were delivered” to Christ “of *his Father*,” whose will Christ always sought. Thus is *the Father* spoken of in the New Testament as the Source from which all things have proceeded, and to whom all things tend.

The Son (or Son of God) is spoken of in the New Testament as distinct from the Father, but intimately united with him. The Father gives power : the Son receives it. The Father gives life : the Son receives it. The Son does nothing but what he seeth the Father do. “The Father hath sent me,” he says ; “and I live by the Father.” “I am not alone ; but I, and the Father who sent me.” “The Son is in the Father, and the Father in him.” “No man cometh to the Father but by” him. He shows the Father to the world. The Father is glorified in the Son. He is in the bosom of the Father. The Father sent him to be the Saviour of the world. “He that hath the Son hath life ;” “And in him is everlasting life.”

The Holy Spirit, which came after Jesus left the world (also called the Holy Ghost and the Spirit of God), is an inward revelation of God and of Christ. It teaches all things, comforts, convinces. It is a spirit of life, lifts one above the flesh, makes one feel that he is a Son of God, communicates a variety of gifts, produces unity in the Church, sanctifies, sheds the love of God into the heart,

and renews the soul. The New Testament speaks of joy in the Holy Ghost, power of the Holy Ghost, and communion of the Holy Ghost.

According to the New Testament, the Father would seem to be the Source of all things, the Creator, the Fountain of being and of life. The Son is spoken of as the manifestation of that Being in Jesus Christ; and the Holy Ghost is spoken of as a spiritual influence, proceeding from the Father and the Son, dwelling in the hearts of believers, as the source of their life,—the idea of God seen in causation, in reason, and in conscience, as making the very life of the soul itself.

There are these three revelations of God, and we know of no others. They are distinct from each other in form, but the same in essence. They are not merely three names for the same thing; but they are real personal manifestations of God, real subsistences, since he is personally present in all of them. This view avoids all heresies, since it neither “divides the substance” nor “confounds the persons.” And these are really the two heresies, which are the most common, and the most to be avoided. I think it can be easily shown that these are the great practical dangers to be avoided. To “divide the substance” is so to separate the revelations of God as to make them contradict or oppose each other: to “confound the persons” is not to recognize each as an independent source of truth to the soul.

There is, therefore, an essential truth hidden in the idea of the Trinity. While the Church doctrine, in every form which it has hitherto taken, has failed to satisfy the human intellect, the Christian heart has clung to the substance contained in them all. Let us endeavor to see what is the practical value of this doctrine, for the sake of which its

errors of statement have been pardoned. What does it say to the Christian consciousness?

The Trinity, truly apprehended, teaches, by its doctrine of Tri-personality, that God is *immanent* in nature, in Christ, and in the soul. It teaches that God is not *outside* of the world, making it as an artisan makes a machine; nor *outside* of Christ, sending him, and giving to him miraculous powers; nor outside of the soul, touching it *ab extra* from time to time with unnatural influences, revolutionizing and overturning it; but that he is personally present in each and all. So that, when we study the mysteries and laws of nature, we are drawing near to God himself, and looking into his face. When we see Christ, we see God, who is in Christ; and when we look into the solemn intuitions of our soul, the monitions of conscience, and the influences which draw our heart to goodness, we are meeting and communing with God.

Moreover, the Trinity, truly apprehended, teaches, by its doctrine of *One Substance* (the Homousion), that these three revelations, though distinct, are essentially at one; that nature cannot contradict revelation; that revelation cannot contradict nature; and that the intuitions of the soul cannot be in conflict with either. Hence it teaches that the Naturalist need not fear revelation; nor the Christian believer, natural Theism. Since it is one and the same God who dwells in nature, in Christ, and in the soul, all his revelations must be in harmony with each other. To suppose otherwise is to "divide the substance" of the Trinity.

And again: the Trinity, rightly understood, asserts the distinctness of these three personal revelations. It is the same God who speaks in each; but he says something new each time. He reveals a new form of his being. He

shows us, not the same order and aspect of truth in each manifestation, but wholly different aspects.

And yet again: as the doctrine teaches that the Son is begotten of the Father, and the Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son, it thereby shows how the revelation in nature prepares for the revelation in Christ, and both for the revelation in the soul.

The error of "dividing the substance" is perhaps the most common. The man who sees God in nature, sees him only there: therefore God loses to him that personal character which seems especially to be seen through Christ; for God, as a Person, comes to us most in Christ, and then is recognized also in nature and the soul as a personal Being. So, without Christ, natural religion is cold: it wants love; it wants life. But, on the other hand, the Christian believer who avoids seeing God in nature, and who finds him only in his Bible, loses the sense of law or order, of harmonious growth, and becomes literal, dogmatic, and narrow. And so, too, the mystic, believing only in God's revelation through the soul, and not going to nature or to Christ, becomes withdrawn from life, and has a morbid and ghastly religion; and, having no test by which to judge his inward revelations, may become the prey of all fantasies and all evil spirits, lying spirits, foul spirits, and cruel spirits.

Such errors come from "dividing the substance;" and they are also only too common. So that, when the true doctrine of Trinity in Unity is apprehended, the most beneficial results may be expected to flow into the life of the Church. No longer believed as a dead formula, no longer held in the letter which killeth, no longer accepted outwardly as a dogma or authority, but seen, felt, and realized in the daily activity of the intellect and heart, the whole

Church will recover its lost union, sects will disappear, and the old feud between science and religion for ever cease. Science will become religious, and religion scientific. Science, no longer cold and dead, but filled through and through with the life of God, will reach its hand to Christianity. Piety, no longer an outlaw from nature, no longer exiled from life into churches and monasteries, will inform and animate all parts of human daily action. Christianity, no longer narrow, Jewish, bigoted, formal, but animated by the great liberty of a common life, will march onward to conquer all forms of error and evil in the omnipotence of universal and harmonious truth.

Natural religion, Christianity, and spiritual piety, being thus harmonized, nature will be more warm, Christ more human, and the divine influences in the soul more uniform and constant. Nature will be full of God, with a sense of his presence penetrating it everywhere. Christianity will become more natural, and all its great facts assume the proportion of laws, universal as the universe itself. Divine influences will cease to be spasmodic and irregular, and become calm, serene, and pure, an indwelling life of God in the soul.

A simple Unity, as held by the Jews and Mohammedans, and by most of the Christian Unitarians, is a bald Unity and an empty Unity. It shows us one God, but God withdrawn from nature, from Christ, from the soul; not immanent in any, but outside of them. It leaves nature godless; leaves Christ *merely* human; leaves the soul a machine to be moved by an external impulse, not an inward inspiration.

We conclude, finally, that no doctrine of Orthodoxy is so false in its form, and so true in its substance, as this. There is none so untenable as dogma, but none so indis-

pensable as experience and life. The Trinity, truly received, would harmonize science, faith, and vital piety. The Trinity, as it now stands in the belief of Christendom, at once confuses the mind, and leaves it empty. It feeds us with chaff, with empty phrases and forms, with no real inflowing convictions. It seems to lie like a vessel on the shore, of no use where it is, yet difficult to remove and get afloat; but when the tide rises, and the vessel floats, it will be able to bear to and fro the knowledge of mankind, and unite various convictions in living harmony. It is there for something. It is providentially allowed to remain in the creeds of the Church for something. It has in itself the seed of a grand future; and, though utterly false and empty as it is taught and defended, it is kept by the deeper instinct of the Christian consciousness, like the Christ in his tomb, waiting for the resurrection.

AN ADDRESS

To the Ministers of the Western Conference, on the Relations of the Minister to his People.

[Delivered at Toledo, Ohio, June 19, 1863; and published by request of the Conference.]

BY G. W. HOSMER, D.D.

ONE of the brightest ministers among us has said, "We want no lectures upon the pastoral care: they are an impertinence, an intervention to be deprecated." There are books upon the subject, and methods of treating it, that have made me think so sometimes. Sciences, languages, schools of literature, histories, interpretation of

the Scriptures, must be taught. There must be books and lectures to aid the student. Things unknown must be sought out. But the pastoral care all lies in open daylight. It is the friendly help a man may give his neighbors, touching their spiritual wants and needs, in prosperity and adversity, joy and sorrow; and a man of good common sense, with Christ in his heart, loving God, and loving his neighbor, can hardly go wrong. The pastor, to be successful, must be a warm-hearted, whole-souled, religious man. He must have force of will, that he may be strength to those who are weak; he must be well poised in his life, that he may be a balance-wheel in his parish; he must have resources, depth and breadth of capacity and attainment, above the average about him. The pastor needs to be a man of worth, significance, and power.

There is an idea that there is no sphere for power in pastoral duty; that the pulpit requires strength, but that the pastoral work may be done by any active, sympathetic, good-natured man of pleasant manners. And such a one may render valuable service in many ways; but the greatest pastoral efficiency requires the highest qualities of character. An ordinary man may be a very good preacher; may have learning and eloquence, and thrill great assemblies: but the ordinary man cannot go into an afflicted family, and stand face to face with the soul in its anguish, without showing his weakness. The ordinary man cannot stand up in his parish in great moral emergencies, and be the load-star of principle, and the preponderating will for right. The ordinary man cannot go to the individuals of his parish needing conversion and quickening, and put the power of his own spirit into their souls.

Said a leading man in one of the Eastern States to me, when he was afraid his minister would remove to another

parish, "I know not what I should do. I have had doubts and distrust about religion and about ministers; but this man I can trust. I know him. He is reliable. He can lead me along. Others could preach as well, — better than he, — but he has come close to me; and I know he is true, honest, genuine." Now, an ordinary, poorly furnished, unbalanced man could never have made that parishioner feel as he did. It is no small thing to think of preaching to such men as John Adams, with his grand rationality; and to Thomas Jefferson, with his fine mind warped with Calvinistic dogmas: but many might do very well preaching to such men, who would be utterly ineffectual in meeting them as pastors in trying hours. The pastor can do without genius, or any extraordinary compass of powers: but he must have sense and judgment; he must be profoundly religious; he must be able to meet his people on the higher planes of their experience. The farmer, the mechanic, the lawyer, the physician, will be more readily drawn to a minister who is not ignorant of things in their spheres. But especially the pastor needs to have a genuine manliness. He is to come close to people, — meet them face to face, and eye to eye. Canting insincerity will not do. He must be earnest, and have a large, generous heart in his bosom, full of sympathies from those great head-springs, — love to God, and love to man. No matter how much genius, learning, science, — the more the better; but sense, judgment, and Christian manliness, there must be, and profound and vivid religious convictions and feeling.

What need of lecturing on pastoral duty? I am ready sometimes to say. Put a really Christian man into a parish, — a man with Christ in his heart, — and he would go to work and do the right things, and do them in the right way. The waters of the mountain-spring need no

lectures how to flow, nor which way ; they must flow, and will make channels ; and verdure and beauty will tell of their onward course from the mountain to the sea. So the pastor, brimming full of consecrated humanity, will live and move and bless his parish every day. But we want the mountain-springs. Influence, like water, cannot rise higher than its head. We are slow to accept this. Only think of the ways devised to make streams of influence run up hill ! What burdens of hypocrisy and falsehood and pretension ! What a laying-hold of degrees, certificates, letters of recommendation, official names, garments, insignia ! But nothing will do. A weak, insignificant man cannot be a mountain-spring, do what you will with him. You may lecture him till you and he are gray ; you may ordain him, give him prefix and suffix for his name ; you may put a mitre on his head, and crosier in his hand, and cover him with holy garments ; and yet you cannot make his influence rise and stay one inch above his head. In our Protestant and Liberal churches this is especially true. Counterfeits are soon detected. Shams cannot stand a month. The demand for genuineness is imperative. The fear of being imposed upon among us is morbid ; and some of our young men are made afraid to say that they are Christians or believe in God.

We want ministers to be mountain-springs, especially in their pastoral labors. Reservoirs and cisterns will not do so well. A sermon written out of a reservoir, however well filled, is not promising. But reservoir-sermons will do better than reservoir pastoral visits. The pastor needs to be a strong, full, quickening man, so charged with electric vitality, that influence is felt on merely touching the hem of his garment. A clear-headed, discerning man once told me, that the only time he ever met Dr. Chan-

ning, and heard him speak, was in the house of one of the doctor's parishioners, just after a member of the household had ceased to breathe. "And," said he, "I saw how great he was; not from what he said, so much as from what he did not say. No commonplace words; not much talk about the scene of departure; but a few grand expressions, with the coloring and emphasis of his rich soul, carried them all into the depths of immortality. He seemed like a man at home there."

To do a pastor's work most effectually, we must have this superior tone and quality. We must carry about a heavenly presence; living simply in great truths and principles, and in great love. My brothers, if we can only have the life in us, it will have power, and quicken all around us. Think of Christ moving about Nazareth, Galilee, Judæa. What pastoral labors! and how their influence was felt! His words in the temple were grand and inspiring. There, as a preacher, he rose to the great occasion. "If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink." And then think of him in the home of Bethany. It is a pastoral visit. Behold the Master! — his superior influence like clear, sweet water from a mountain-spring; and the thoughtful Mary sat at his feet, and heard his words. What a great thing it was to have such a visitor! and what a privilege to be able to make such visits!

The truths and principles that were in Christ, so full of spirit and life, may be in every minister, — must be, brothers, in you and me, before we can be effectual pastors.

I always shrink somewhat uneasily as I begin to talk to young men about the ways and means of pastoral work. If the ministers are not mountain-springs, if the power is not in them, it will do little good to talk to them about ways and means. Alas the busy minister of myriad methods, with no soul to put into them! And then, if

the minister has the power in him, who doubts that in some way it will work out? And again I always have some fear of obstructing free activities by my ways and means. We are wonderfully unlike in our aptitudes; and, in a large sense, every one works best in his own methods. And now, in doing this work which you have assigned me, I am not to give you my ways and means; certainly not with any injunction, that you make my ways your ways. I hope you are all head-springs, and can make better ways for yourselves than mine would be. This holding you in the subject of pastoral influence, and making you think of it in its various lights, may do you good.

The importance of pastoral work, and the power it requires, are underrated. The pulpit is conspicuous and exacting, and takes the best of our time and strength. I think it should be so. The pulpit must be filled with power, or it will not be surrounded by appreciative hearers. The pulpit is the minister's throne; and yet some of the most successful ministers have done more out of the pulpit than in it. They have organized great spiritual forces in the homes of their parishes, and in society all about them. They are stronger as men and Christian workers than as preachers. It is certain that no man can preach in the best way, until, as the pastor, he takes the pulpit. In the homes and hearts of his parish, the minister gets inspiration to preach. The earnest pastor writes with his people before him; and, when in the pulpit, the heart of the congregation touches his; deep calleth unto deep. Theological lectures, philosophical disquisitions, may be written and read by a minister who has not learned the roads and paths about his parish; but sermons out of the heart and soul, and reaching heart and soul, generally grow out of love, sympathy, and anxious solicitude

for parishioners. Said a wise minister, "What shall I do for sermons to preach abroad? Mine are full of my own parishioners." No minister can preach as well as he ought, unless he has the pastoral care of his hearers.

What is the pastoral care of a parish? It is all that various service that will give unity to the parish, and organic life, and promote the spiritual welfare of all its members. The parish, comprising all the varieties of human nature, must be one system, centring about the great Christian truths with a hearty *esprit de corps*. This unity must be an organized wholeness. There is unity in a mass of earth, in a flock of sheep, in a herd of cattle. A parish must be a unity of free, independent persons, all held in place, and moved in harmonious activities, by love to God and man, — a Christian commonwealth. The pastor must be everywhere in the parish, — his eye upon all the parts, — making it sure that all are touched by the religious attractions, and keep step to the grand life-march of duty. The pastor needs a quick eye, a sound discretion, a cunning hand.

And now a thought about ways and means. No one needs go over the sea to Germany, nor to the depths of speculation at his wits' ends, to be told just how the pastor should work and what he should do. Of course, he must get acquainted with his parish, with families and individuals. They are all to be his family. It is a touching thing in the Catholic Church to hear all the ministers called fathers. Protestantism has no name so significant as this. And the timid young minister would soon be able to bear it; and it might make him as venerable as gray hairs.

It might be a good plan for a minister to keep a parish-record, — if he had a place where no eye but his would see it, — in which every family and person should be

journalized. Such a record would insure careful observation of characters, and thorough knowledge of persons; and there would be leaves of such a record full of interest. Some pastors have too much book-keeping about their work. They make a record of every parochial visit; go round their parishes once or twice a year, as regularly as the minute-hand goes round the dial of a watch, and almost as mechanically. The pastor must have methods; but let him be master of them, not they masters of him. He must avoid favoritism and partialities. He should have a heart too large and Christian for fastidious, dainty friendship. Christ sat at meat with publicans and sinners, said the ceremonial Jews. His charity took all humanity into its arms. Alas for the minister who is so dapper in his tastes as not to see a good heart, if under a coarse dress or behind awkward manners!

With thorough acquaintance with his parishioners, the minister will see cases that need treatment. Here is a young man playing with temptation; putting a serpent into his bosom. There is a business-man digging his grave, and about to bury himself in his worldliness. There is a woman so cumbered with much serving, so overwhelmed with factitious necessities, that her soul's life is almost worried out. Such cases, all about him, the pastor sees: and he may take them, one after another, into special treatment; always having one or more, and following up his efforts persistently, as long as there is hope.

Here is a leaf from a pastor's record:—

“In the year 1838, there moved into my village parish a young physician. He came from a neighboring town, where he had been in practice a few years. I had often heard of him,—a young man of fine ability, good manners, and considerable culture; very sure to be eminent in his profession. But he was

sceptical. With much pride of opinion, he loved to talk about Christianity, and bring objections to it, and hold arguments with those who would stand up its advocates. I felt concerned for my parish. I saw that such a man might do great injury to the young men, and, through them, to a whole generation. His winning address, quick wit, withering sarcasm, made him dangerous, — a wolf in my fold. And yet I would not meet him as a wolf, but as a gifted young man, whose early influences had hurt his vision. I sought his acquaintance; made my way to his heart; won his respect and confidence. I made time to meet him as often as I could find opportunity. I avoided controversy and argument about religion, lest he should brace and fortify himself against me. I hoped he might come to me, and voluntarily open his heart. Months passed. At length, one Monday morning, passing his office, I saw him sitting alone, and called upon him. Looking up from his thoughtful mood, said he, ‘You are the very man I want to see. Yesterday you gave the best argument for the reality of religion that I ever met. Sit down, and tell me just how these things bear upon your soul.’ I did not know what he meant. I said, ‘Why, I made no argument yesterday!’ — ‘Yes,’ said he, ‘you did. In the close of your morning sermon, in your appeal to us to live more religiously, you looked as if you should die if we did not do better. That look touched me as no argument ever did before. That look was an argument. Now tell me about your foundations and experience.’ The door was open to me into his soul. I entered in, and led him to points of view that were new to him. I helped him to see religion, Christianity, Christ, God, immortality, duty, in new lights. He became interested; was a new creature in a new life, his old scepticisms gone; and grand, vital beliefs strengthened his soul. He became a member of our Christian communion, and a helper to his pastor in all good works.”

The pastor goes to the sick and the dying to tell them of the soul that can live in its immortality, despite the body's ills and dissolution. He goes with words of Jesus,

with hymn and psalm; and he must go with his soul in his eyes, and his heart on his lips, and each hand a good Samaritan.

A father and son were ministers in distant parishes. The son made a record of best thoughts, that he might have them to help him in last moments, when too weak to think, and get above the body's anguish. At length, the son was summoned to the father's death-bed. He found the old man sinking away. The father grasped his son's strong hand, and said, "Oh! give me a great thought to sustain me in this agony!" — and the son read from the record he had made, "Best thoughts for last moments." The pastor must go to the sick, the weary, the sinking ones, with great thoughts, every one of them a shining angel to help and cheer. That beseeching cry, "Give me a great thought to sustain me," indicates a want in hours of sickness and decline which a pastor must strive to meet. He must seek ways and means to lift up the sinking soul, fettered and weighed down by the sick body. He must go with the dying through the valley, helping them to see lights all along and up beyond; so that it is no longer the dark valley of the shadow of death.

The pastor should be a man among men. He should have a pilot's eye upon the ocean of life, and be enough acquainted with business, politics, statesmanship, to know where truth and right lie, and be ready to speak for them, or, if need be, give up his parish, his living, in their service.

But pastors may meddle unwisely, and stir up strife and bitterness. Alas for those who love to live in a storm, — who go about seeking a martyr's crown! But then, on the other hand, what temptations, in these times, to dodge and hide and lie and keep peace by giving up truth and right to be crucified! Our Scylla and Charyb-

dis are very close together, — almost touch. May God help us to find the way between the fatal extremes!

Passing over much that I will not take time to speak of, — which, perhaps, is too plain to every one's common sense to need to be spoken (all about a pastor's ways and means and plans to do good), — it is to be remembered, that the pastor's sphere is the homes of his parish. His own home should be a model. A bad home in the parsonage, close by the church, will spoil the effect of even good sermons. The parsonage should give the key-note in simple refinement of taste and manners; in a genuine religious spirit; in a loving harmony; in a wise, Christian helpfulness. Happy the parish that has a home in the parsonage, where heaven and earth meet in unison!

Finally, in a word, let me set up the ideal of pastoral influence. I see it symbolized in this picture, so often seen in our houses, of Dante and Beatrice. In her translation by death to spiritual life, she became, to the poetic eye of his mind, the beau-ideal of a divine holiness; and while she, looking to the Father, rose nearer, nearer, to his excellence, he, looking up to her, rose nearer and nearer, both ascending towards the highest.

“ Her eyes fast fixed on the eternal wheels,
Beatrice stood unmoved; and I with ken
Fixed upon her. . . .
Words may not tell of that transhuman change;
And therefore let example serve, though weak,
For those whom Grace has better things in store.”

Happy that parish which is drawn by loving sympathy to their pastor, while he is constantly ascending into all the sweet and mighty sanctities of earth and heaven, — alluring to brighter worlds, and leading the way!

AFTER THE BATTLE.

A VISIT TO GETTYSBURG.

ON Saturday evening, July 4, we saw, in the "New-York Herald" of the same day, the name of our nephew, an officer of a Pennsylvania regiment; and against the name these ominous words, "wounded and missing." We determined to leave the next evening (Sunday) for Gettysburg, to look for him there. I went to Boston to find the Governor, and get a letter to the military authorities of Baltimore. The Governor's house was closed. He had taken the opportunity (so I learned afterwards) of the 4th of July, not to go into the country to rest and enjoy himself, as I then supposed, but to shut himself in the State House with his secretaries, and work all day, undisturbed by callers. The Common was crowded with a great multitude, whose faces would be suddenly illuminated as the electric light would flash upon them. This light, which illuminates every thing within its range for miles, would help our blockaders on a dark night immensely.

Sunday evening, at six, we set out for New York; the cars filled and overfilled with men, whom we supposed to be escaping from the draft, but who were on their return to Worcester and other stations from the 4th-of-July festivities.

In New York at five, A.M., Monday; in Philadelphia at twelve. There we staid till three, P.M., inquiring at the Army Directory of the Sanitary Commission, at the Medical Bureau, at the military bureaus, at the hospitals; but hear nothing of our wounded soldier. So, at three, we go on to Baltimore; and arrive at the Eutaw House at seven or eight, P.M.

The halls of this excellent hotel are full of soldiers, among whom I recognize at once many friends. Massachusetts is well represented at Gen. Schenck's head-quarters. I have no difficulty about the pass to Gettysburg. In fact, almost the first person I see is an old friend, an important member of the Sanitary Commission, who is sending up car-loads of comforts and necessities for the wounded, and agents of the Commission to distribute them. "You can go to-night at twelve," says he, "as one of our agents." So I decide to go. But as it is possible that the young lieutenant-colonel we are seeking may be in Baltimore, and not in Gettysburg, my wife remains to look for him there, while I go on.

So, about midnight, I find myself in a dark freight-car, — from which, however, I get transferred into a passenger-car by and by, — and am going slowly to the scene of action. Our passenger-car is attached to a long line of freight-cars. There is no conductor to the train, only an engineer. The stops are many and long; for there is but one track. The engine toils up the steep grades, and at last stands still, dead beat. In twelve hours, we had gone about half of the seventy-five miles. Nothing to eat but a piece of bread bought at a wayside inn or grocery. "Patienza!" The sun is going down: it is five o'clock in the afternoon, when we at last stop a mile or two from the town. The first person almost whom I see is the colonel of my nephew's regiment. He tells me that the young man is in the place: "He has lost his right arm, but is doing well. Take this card: you can find him by it."

I go on at once to the town. It is a small one, and I expect to find him at once. But such is the utter confusion which prevails, that I do not succeed till after three hours' search. During that time, I visit the hospitals in the churches, where the men are close as they can lie; I visit

the Provost Marshal's office; I hunt up surgeons; I call at one house after another. But the whole town has been turned inside out and upside down, and no one knows where any one else is. But an officer tells me that one of his friends will be able, in an hour or so, to take me to the place I am seeking. So I employ that hour in going up the Emmetsburg road to visit a part of the field of battle.

It was the decisive battle of the war. One of our generals told me that he had it from one of the Confederate generals taken prisoner at Gettysburg, that Gen. Lee entered Pennsylvania with a highly disciplined army of nearly a hundred thousand men. Gen. Lee assured every one, that he should remain as long as he wished; that there was no earthly power strong enough to drive him back across the Potomac. He expected to meet, conquer, and destroy the Army of the Potomac; then to march on Baltimore, and occupy it, laying it under military contributions; then to march on Washington, and dictate terms of peace in our capital. Such was his plan. Its success depended on his defeating our army; but of that he felt certain. He had defeated it at Chancellorsville by one of his brilliant manœuvres. He considered it demoralized by that defeat and by frequent change of commanders. He knew his own army to be larger, and better disciplined. He believed that he should be able, as before, to select his own position, and break down our army by hurling concentrated masses of troops upon the weakest points. He had from eighty to ninety thousand men; Gen. Meade, from sixty to seventy thousand. It will be seen, therefore, how important this battle was to our cause. If our army had been routed, it is certain that we could not have held Baltimore, — probably not Washington. I was told in Baltimore, that the friends of the Confederates had made all their preparations to welcome the army of Lee. They

were expecting them within a week in that city. There was a home-guard there indeed, and barricades capable of resisting a dash of cavalry, but not of keeping out for an hour a victorious army. I saw these barricades in all the main avenues of the city, and fortifications recently erected on the outskirts of Baltimore, but nothing capable of an effective defence.

We see, then, the greatness of the danger to which we were exposed, and from which we were delivered by the heroism of the Army of the Potomac and the skill of our generals. The more I look at it, the more I deem it the greatest crisis of the war, and the battle of Gettysburg the most decisive battle ever fought on this continent. If the Confederate Army was not destroyed nor captured, let us be consoled: it was turned back, and its pride and power effectually broken down. If Lee had occupied Baltimore and Washington, even the taking of Vicksburg and Port Hudson and Charleston would have been small consolation to us. Let us thank God to-day, then, for the crowning mercy that he vouchsafed us on those bloody but glorious days. As I paced over the field torn with shot, stumbled over unexploded projectiles, and kicked aside the cartridges which lay on the ground where the lines had stood; as I saw the horses and men yet lying where they fell four days before; as I marked some of the points where the great struggle took place, — the lines of Bryant recurred to my heart: —

“ Oh! never shall the land forget
Where gushed the best blood of its brave,
Gushed warm with hope and valor yet,
Upon the soil they fought to save.”

It was on Tuesday afternoon, four days after the battle, that I spent an hour on the field. The sun shone brightly over the scene. I was alone, and was glad to be alone.

The town of Gettysburg gave no evidence of having been the scene of any great struggle. No houses had been burned, no walls injured by artillery, not even windows broken. The high discipline of the Confederate Army is attested by this fact. They took bread and food from the inhabitants, but little else. I am sorry to say, that their army probably did less damage in Pennsylvania than ours has often done in Virginia; and the reason is, that a severe and rigid discipline has been enforced by the Confederate generals, which our generals have not been able to imitate. Theirs is a regular army: ours is one of volunteers. Inferior to ours in enthusiasm and intelligence, they are a better machine for fighting purposes. Any man who deserts or flinches is shot: but our good-hearted President allows no such severity among us; and so thousands of lives are lost by disastrous retreats and defeats, in order to save a few deserters from being punished. The awful nature of war requires that it be carried on as war, and not as peace.

So, I say, the little village of Gettysburg, containing between three and four thousand inhabitants, had not suffered severely from the thousands of shell and shot which had been fired directly over it from two hundred cannon in position. I walked up its streets, and saw its ladies sitting in their open doorways, talking, laughing, as though nothing had happened. And, indeed, some of them told me, that, on one of the three days, they did not know the battle was going on till it was over. All the churches of the place had been turned into hospitals. I went into one or two of them, seeking for the young lieutenant-colonel whom I had come to look after. The pews were floored over, and the men lay close together, with every variety of wounds, in the head, the body, the arms, the limbs; but they were all so patient and so quiet, that it touched one's heart to see them.

I found my lieutenant-colonel at last, after two or three hours' search among the ten thousand wounded in and around Gettysburg. He was a graduate of Harvard, 1862; and commanded a regiment of four hundred men in the first day's battle, when the First and Eleventh Army Corps held back, for four long hours, the whole of Lee's army.

This regiment, with two others, making twelve hundred in all, held back five thousand. They were shelled for an hour, and then were under a fire of musketry from the whole five thousand for another hour. Most of the officers were hit, some of them two or three times. Of four hundred men belonging to this regiment, who went into the fight, a hundred and five only came out untouched. The young man of whom I write, the Harvard graduate, commanded his regiment through this fight, and was hit three times; the last time as he was standing in front of his line, waving his sword to encourage his men, when his sword dropped, and he found himself shot through the arm. He went back, tied up his arm himself, then selected an officer to take his place; and, not wishing to take a single man away from the fight, walked alone a mile and a half to the hospital, and reported himself to the surgeon, who amputated the arm. I mention this case, because I happen to know it, to illustrate the spirit in which our young soldiers go into the battle.

I walked up the road from the town, toward the cemetery. All along the way lay torn equipments, broken ramrods and guns and bayonets, cartridge-boxes and cartridges. Here lay in the road a dead horse. In a field, not far off, I saw what looked like a man. I went up, and found a man, in the rebel uniform, lying on his back, his face black as a coal, from exposure to the sun, his hand white, and held up toward me in an attitude which seemed to say, "Help me!" I went on, and came to another. He

was lying crouched together, his gun fallen under him. Some were shot through the head, others through the body. So I walked on, looking at one and another, each lying in a different attitude, each attitude seeming to show the last thought and feeling which was in the mind of the poor fellow as he died. To us, these men are only rebels; but each of them had a home, mother, wife, children. They look out of their cabin-window, like the mother of Sisera, and say, "When will he come back?" The little children say, "When will papa come back? and what will he bring me?" The mother says, "He has gone into Pennsylvania with Gen. Lee, and he will bring back something for us." "Have they not sped? have they not divided the prey?" Poor desolated homes, South as well as North! Long will they look, and look in vain, for the return of those, dear to them as ours to us, who lie undistinguished, cumbering the bloody field.

I went into the Provost Marshal's room to ask my usual question; and, seeing a young man sitting by the window, said to him, "Is that the Provost Marshal?" He answered, "I don't know: I am a Confederate officer." He was one who had just come in and surrendered himself. I looked in his face: he was young and fair, and with a pleasant expression. "Well," said I, "I don't see that you rebels are so very different from us, after all." Still, there is this great difference: They fight for the South; we, for the nation. They fight for what they call independence: we fight for justice, humanity, and universal liberty against cruel oppression. Our officers and soldiers understand more and more that the conflict is between liberty and slavery, between civilization and barbarism, between Christianity and Antichrist. What else supports them all, and gives them so much patience and fortitude? It is the most marked and glorious feature of the war, this angelic

patience, this supreme peace of men who seem to have lost every thing that makes life worth having. I saw a man, whose eyes were shot out, who was as cheerful, and even merry, as a child. I saw men maimed and with broken constitutions, cruelly lacerated, cripples for life; but they all said, "No matter: we beat them." Some asked, "What do the people say at home about it? don't they think we've done a big thing?" One young man, who had lost a foot, said, "I'd rather have lost the other than not have won the victory." When I opened the door of my nephew's room, I confess I trembled. I thought of that lost right arm,—such a loss to a youth in the beginning of life. It seemed almost too hard. But when I saw him so cheerful and contented, and only wishing to get well that he might go back again to his place, with his sword in his left hand; when I saw them all so, and heard these young officers, shot through the back and shoulder and arms and both legs, talking about it as of some grand and glad experience through which they had safely come; when I saw them so modest and so manly, without any undue exultation, but with this earnest satisfaction in having done something really great,—I shared their spirit, and could not grieve any more for their loss. I saw that each lost limb, each scar, each wound, was the cross of the Legion of Honor, to be worn always, as a proof that they had deserved well of their country, as a proof to themselves that they had not lived in vain. These young men, who, had there been no war, would many of them have passed inglorious lives for common objects, have risen to a point of great self-devotion, and are ennobled in soul and heart for ever; so that the old now look to the young for inspiration and consolation. We go to them for lessons of patience and of courage. We catch their nobler fire, and are comforted in their comfort, partaking of their enthusiasm for the good cause. "Out

of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast Thou ordained strength, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger."

This war has had one grand effect. It has brought all the best men and women of every section into intimate contact; giving them full knowledge of each other, and strong sympathy with each other. They fight side by side on the same battle-field; they lie side by side in the hospitals, — men of Minnesota and of Maine, of Illinois and Massachusetts; women of New England in hospitals on the Mississippi, or teaching contrabands in Louisiana and South Carolina. This is what is to make the Union more solid and real than ever before. The war of the Revolution, in which men of all the States fought together, was the foundation of the present Union. It made the adoption of the Federal Constitution possible. The present war will make a better Union still. Never was New England so well known, and therefore so much loved and honored, as to-day. At Toledo and in Milwaukie, I lately talked with eminent men who had never seen New England, — Western governors and Congress-men; and they spoke in terms of admiration of Massachusetts, stronger than I ever heard at home. In Baltimore, I found Massachusetts men on the staff of the commanding-general, Massachusetts men in other offices of importance, Massachusetts men in charge of hospitals, Massachusetts men in the Sanitary Commission. When I wanted a pass and transportation to Gettysburg, Massachusetts men were there ready to get it for me. When I wanted information at head-quarters, or at the Medical Bureau, or at military offices in Philadelphia or Baltimore or Gettysburg, there was Massachusetts to help me. Everywhere I met Massachusetts. Massachusetts was on its way to the sick and wounded, in the form of men and women, going to nurse

them; in the form of cars, laden down with hospital supplies; and Massachusetts also came to the front in the form of three of her regiments, nine-months' men, whose time had expired, but who volunteered to go to the army of the Potomac, and who went to Frederic in Maryland, and joined Meade there. These were the eighth, the fifty-first, the forty-sixth, and a part of the forty-third. Give to them all honor.

In the midnight train in which I left Baltimore on Tuesday night, July 7, there were forty or fifty men and women, members of the Christian Commission, on their way to nurse and tend the sick. I learn that they were very useful there. This Christian Commission is doing much good in this way. Of course, it cannot rival the Sanitary Commission in its arrangements for carrying supplies; for the Sanitary Commission has had two years' experience, has the full confidence and co-operation of Government, has an admirably organized system of transportation, and has agents of the most thorough training for their work. Money or articles given to the Sanitary Commission go with unerring certainty just where they will do the most good. The Sanitary Commission also had the privilege of the railroad to Gettysburg for its cars. I rode up with three of its cars loaded with supplies,—one of them called an "Arctic car;" being, in fact, a refrigerator on wheels, carrying ice and fruit and vegetables and fresh meats to the hospitals. Of the Sanitary Commission, I can only say, the more I saw of it, the more I was astonished at its admirable and perfect adaptation to its objects. It was the first organization which had supplies at Gettysburg. It was on the field while the battle was going on. Its agents are sometimes taken prisoners while at their charitable work. It is flexible to every new need, adapts itself to every exigency,

has its agents everywhere, and is now felt by the Government and Medical Bureau to be an indispensable auxiliary in this great conflict. Help it to the utmost; help it regularly: there is nothing better to do.

Who does not see, more and more, how God is educating this nation by all these awful trials? First came disasters to purify and chasten us, and teach us, that, if we would succeed, we must fight, not for our own cause merely, but also for that of justice and humanity; and now victories have come, but come in such a way as that we shall not be too much elated, but only encouraged to carry on the work aright. Then comes this rebellion at home, this outbreak in our own cities, to show us that the evil spirit is one and the same in South Carolina and in New York. We have to put down the evil spirit which hates its brother; which despises the black man; which only seeks its own selfish good, and tramples on all rights but its own. That evil spirit has to be rooted out of the land, North as well as South, before lasting peace can return.

It may be that God has worse punishments in store for us. It may be that there is to be civil war at home, or foreign war. But we see this clearly, that "the axe is laid at the root of the tree;" that God is making clean work; that he has shut up against us every door of compromise or concession by which we might escape; that he has trained our young men to a noble spirit of self-sacrifice; that he has given us a noble army of martyrs to lead us up to a high devotion; that he sends chastisements, one after another, as we are able to bear them; that he inspires us with victory, and tempers us with defeat; and that he is doing his work thoroughly, to make the nation what it ought to be.

"Well roars the storm to those who hear
A deeper voice within the storm."

DOCTORS AND DOCTORATES.

WE have often thought that the subject of honorary degrees, especially that of D.D., was one which ought to be discussed anew. Are these degrees, as now bestowed, useful or otherwise? Is there any question of right or of propriety connected with giving and receiving them? If they are useless or hurtful, what change can be made in our university system in regard to them?

The question concerning the degree of Doctor of Divinity belongs, moreover, to Christian ethics, as well as to the domain of scholarly propriety. Many good men have thought it wrong to give or receive this title, because inconsistent with the principles of Christian humility and equality laid down in the New Testament. Our Master once said to his disciples, "Be not ye like the Pharisees, who love to be called of men Rabbi. Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your master, Christ, and all ye are brethren." When a man loves to be called "Doctor," or allows himself to be called "Doctor," does he, or does he not, violate this command? For we suppose the suffix "D.D.," or the prefix "Rev. Dr.," comes about as near being an equivalent to the Jewish title "Rabbi" as one thing can come to another. It was for this reason, probably, that Moses Stuart, one of the most eminent theologians this country has produced, declined this degree when offered to him. Others have done the same; among them, we believe, Andrews Norton and Albert Barnes.

But, on the other hand, it must be admitted that the great majority of wise and good men among us, to whom this mark of respect has been shown, have quietly received it, and allowed it to be applied to them. In most cases, doubtless, it was not because they loved the title, or were

ambitious of the honor, but because they thought it kindly meant, and therefore not to be rejected, or because they did not think it of sufficient importance to be declined. Therefore, such men as William Ellery Channing, Henry Ware, Jr., F. W. P. Greenwood, and others among the honored dead, and such men as James Walker, Ezra S. Gannett, Frederic H. Hedge, William G. Eliot, and others among the wise and good still spared to us, in our own denomination, have not refused the degree. It is difficult for any one else to decline what such men have been willing to accept. It must appear a foolish presumption, an opinionated self-conceit, to pass what seems like an implied censure on such men, by criticising and finding fault with that which they have all been willing to accept.

Nevertheless, no amount of authority can settle permanently a question of right. It still remains to be asked, Are these honors right in themselves, and useful in their influence? Without, therefore, intending disrespect to the university which bestows them, or the many wise and good men who have received them, we proceed to a brief and necessarily superficial discussion of some of the objections to the degree of Doctor of Divinity as now bestowed.

1. This degree apparently conflicts with the principles of humility and equality which should characterize the Christian Church.

All that our Saviour has said concerning his kingdom implies that it is one in which human honors and human praise are not to be sought after. Without pushing this principle to any pedantic extent, without carrying the democratic principle of Christianity beyond Puritanism into Quakerism, it certainly does appear to be a violation of it to accept ecclesiastical distinctions and honors. That good and wise men have done it, and continue to do it, is no sufficient proof that it is right. Almost every religious

reform has been carried in opposition to the example of good and wise men.

2. Again: if not wrong, the degree is useless, because unmeaning. The degree of *Bachelor of Arts* means that a young man has succeeded in going through college. It means that he has been engaged in certain liberal studies for four years; that he has not been so indolent or immoral as to be dismissed before the expiration of his course. The degree of *Master of Arts* means, that, after obtaining the first degree, the youth has *lived* three years longer, and is willing to pay for his diploma. That is something. But what is the meaning of LL.D.? And, especially, what is the meaning of S.T.D., or of D.D.?

(a) Does it refer to a man's theological learning? Does it mean that a man is a more *learned* theologian than others? Not so: for some of the most learned theologians never are made D.D.'s; because, perhaps, of some unpopular heresy which they believe, or some unpopular reform which they advocate. On the other hand, we have only to look over the list of D.D.'s in any denomination, to see a large number whom it would be an excess of charity to call theologians at all.

So long as Theodore Parker (who was unquestionably one of the most learned theologians of the day) never received this doctorate, it cannot mean that it is a title bestowed on all learned theologians.

Theodore Parker was a heretic, indeed a heresiarch, a leader and chief of heretics. But he unquestionably was very learned in theology. He knew all that had been written on both sides of each theological question. His library of theology was visited and consulted by the most eminent divines of all sects; and he himself was in constant correspondence with leading theologians of all the sects, with Orthodox Professors in Orthodox Colleges and

Theological Schools, who gladly availed themselves of his great learning, and discussed with him, in person and by letter, all the leading questions of theology and ethics. But he never received the degree of Doctor of Divinity. Hence it is evident, that theological learning, by itself at least, is not signified by this title.

(b) Does this title imply, then, that a man is not a heretic, but orthodox, in his religious opinions?

Does it mean, not that the theologian is learned, but that he is sound in the faith? If so, why is the degree given by the same college to men of the most opposite doctrinal opinions; to Trinitarians and Unitarians, to Baptists and Universalists? It cannot mean that the recipient is a sound teacher of the right doctrine, since it is bestowed on those holding every sort of doctrine.

(c) Does it mean that its recipient is a faithful laborer in the Christian field? Does it mean that he has grown old in earnest efforts to promote the cause of piety, charity, freedom, justice, temperance, humanity? If so, why do many receive a degree who never have been eminent for these things? and why, for example, do such men as John Pierpont, Samuel J. May, and William Henry Channing, not receive this honor? Some one once said he had rather be damned with Plato than saved with St. Dominic. So one would easily prefer to remain without a title in company with such men as we have named, rather than to receive those which separate him from their company. Most of those, to be sure, who have been honored with this degree, are good and faithful men; but they are not more good nor more faithful than most of the untitled ministers.

The title of D.D., therefore, on the whole, seems to be *insignificant*; that is, it means nothing. It does not mean that a man is learned in theology, or that he is sound in

the faith, or that he has been a faithful laborer in his Master's vineyard. If it means any thing, it usually means that he is one who has a good many friends, and not many enemies; who is not very unpopular; who has lived, a good while, a not too offensive life; who is therefore considered to be, on the whole, a safe man. But there are so many exceptions even to this description, that it hardly seems to mean even this; and therefore, we repeat, the title is one which is too often without any meaning. Strictly speaking, it signifies nothing.

We once heard Dr. Freeman, the venerable minister of King's Chapel, say, that "the degree of D.D. in the Protestant Church corresponded to the sacrament of extreme unction in the Roman-Catholic Church. In the Catholic Church, when a man has reached the end of life, they administer extreme unction: in the Protestant Church, they make him a D.D."

For these reasons, would it not be well for universities to discontinue giving this degree and other honorary degrees, or to give them in a way that would carry a meaning? Let them be given after an examination. If there was an examination held by persons chosen for the purpose, open under some conditions to all, where they could become candidates for the honorary degrees of Doctors in Divinity, in Medicine, and in Laws, then the diploma would have a meaning. It would be a real honor and an advantage to a young man to have received either of them.

This course has been adopted in England by the University of London, founded in 1836. Its object is, not to teach, but only to confer degrees. It has no colleges, but has affiliated to it most of the colleges of the kingdom. It only confers degrees after an examination; not as the result of a course of study, nor *pro causâ honoris*. It has a *Senatus Academicus*, composed of eminent scholars of all

denominations, and boards of examiners, before whom the candidate for a degree is rigidly examined: if he passes these, it is no matter where he acquired his knowledge.* The examinations are strict and thorough; and they really test the knowledge of the candidate in each department. Students are sent from all the colleges of England, including Oxford and Cambridge, to take their degrees at this university.

That some such plan as this had become necessary in England, appears from the condition into which the great universities had fallen in regard to this matter of degrees. Sir William Hamilton ("Discussions," page 436) says of Oxford, "Degrees there are now empty, or rather delusive, distinctions; for the only education at present requisite for all degrees is the private tuition afforded by the colleges in the elementary department of the lowest faculty alone. Of *ten* degrees still granted in Oxford, *all* are given contrary to statute, and *nine* are in reason and law absolutely worthless."

The same writer says, in another place, of Oxford, "Degrees, — privileged certificates of incompetency, — evacuated of all truth, are here lavished without the legal conditions of university instruction and examination."

Scotland, it seems, is no better. In 1830, a Royal Commission of Inquiry reported that "the utter contempt in which the degree of Master of Arts is held in Scotland, and the notorious inefficiency of the examinations under the existing system, have appeared to us to require a change."

We have not yet reached this low state in *our* universities and colleges; but, unless a severe examination precedes the giving of a degree, there is a constant tendency to

* See "New American Cyclopædia."

make it unimportant. There ought to be an examination for the degree of Master of Arts, and for the degrees of Doctor of Medicine, Doctor of Laws, and Doctor of Divinity. These examinations should be open to the graduates of all respectable colleges, who have received a Bachelor's degree. They should be strict and impartial, not conducted by college-professors, but by men of science appointed for that purpose. This would at once redeem the honor from its present doubtful condition, and make it truly honorable.

Meantime, till this is arranged, would it not be well for those who have received the Doctorate in Divinity to avoid, as much as possible, the use of the title? They can easily signify to their friends, that they much prefer simplicity, and that they will regard it as a friendly act to be addressed by their Christian and family name, without prefix or suffix. Does not the simplicity of the gospel make this desirable? To decline, formally, an honor which has been intended kindly, and which is really felt to be honorable, considered in its source, may seem ostentatious humility or ingratitude; but certainly we can avoid using the title ourselves, and we can ask our friends to omit it in writing to us or about us.

When the Doctorate of Divinity was conferred on Henry Ward Beecher, he wrote a short article, expressing his satisfaction at the good-will therein signified, but added that perhaps the chief benefit was thereby already obtained; and that, though to receive the distinction was gratifying, to use it afterward was unnecessary; and that, therefore, he should prefer to be addressed and spoken of as before,—as plain Henry Ward Beecher. This was good sense, and deserves imitation.

THE PICTURE.*

[The following poem, from the "Saturday-evening Gazette," has qualities of blended truth and beauty not often found in ephemeral verses. We reprint it, without having been requested to do so, from our own sense of its merits. — ED.]

A CALM, sweet face, with earnest eyes
 And thoughtful brow full arched above it;
 A mouth whose graveness won surprise,
 Whose tender sweetness made one love it;
 A face that told how souls aspire
 That look beyond to-day's revealing;
 A boy with all of manhood's fire,
 A man with all of boyhood's feeling.

They told his life; his honored name;
 His spotless worth; his spirit's beauty;
 His few, fair years, yet known to fame;
 His sacrifice for right and duty;
 His earnest love; his winning grace:
 And, while they spoke of death and glory,
 I only read the silent face,
 And dreamed its eyes told all the story.

The soul that waited not for time,
 But sprang at once to perfect flower,
 When the first peal of Freedom's chime
 Rang out for the appointed hour;
 The answering cry, the answering hand,
 Whose honor brooked no base delay,
 But, free for God and native land,
 Flung life, and all it loved, away:
 Yet saw, beyond his loss, the gain;
 And laid, with hands that could not falter,
 His blessed gift of love and pain,
 An offering fair, on Freedom's altar;
 Wrapped all the Future from his sight,
 Thrust back the ties he might not sever,
 Then, proud as one who walks in light,
 Gave up himself to God for ever!

SOUTH QUINCY, August, 1863.

MARIE.

* Of William Lowell Putnam, at the Boston Athenæum.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Since our last Notice.

Common Prayer for Christian Worship. In ten services for morning and evening, with special Collects, Prayers, and occasional Services. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co. 1863.

Substance and Shadow; or, Morality and Religion in their relation to Life: an Essay on the Physics of Creation. By HENRY JAMES. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1863.

Woman and her Saviour in Persia. By a returned Missionary. With fine illustrations, and a Map of Nestorian Country. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1863.

Moral Culture of Infancy, and Kindergarten Guide. With music for the plays. By Mrs. HORACE MANN and ELIZABETH P. PEABODY. Boston: T. O. H. P. Burnham. 1863.

Out-door Papers. By THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1863.

The Soul of Things; or, Psychometric Researches and Discoveries. By WILLIAM and ELIZABETH M. F. DENTON. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co.

Unitarianism in the Present Time: its more important Principles, its Tendencies, and its Prospects. By JOHN ORR, author of "Theism," &c. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co.

Lilian. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.

We have carefully perused the "*Book of Common Prayer for Christian Worship*," prepared by Rev. JAMES MARTINEAU for the Unitarian churches in London, and reprinted here by Walker & Wise. Although it is our business to criticise every thing, and pronounce a judgment on all books after half an hour's reading, and although our friends who are thinking of introducing a Service-book into their churches may very properly ask the "Monthly Journal" to assist them in their choice, yet we hesitate in doing so. The difficulty is this, — the value of such a book can only be known by *using* it; cannot be known by reading it. On the whole, and in general, we can only say, that this seems to be *as good a book of its kind as any that we know.*

There are three kinds of Service-books. 1st, Those which aim at conformity with the service of the universal Church. With these books, the object is to have the same forms of prayer going up simultaneously from all Christian communities in all lands, and these the most ancient and time-hallowed. Hence the Roman Mass has aimed at uniformity; the Common-prayer book of the Church of England has aimed to cleave as near as possible to the Mass-book, but with alterations; the Episcopal Church in America has altered its Prayer-book as little as possible from that of the Church of England; the Stone-chapel Prayer-book, and those of Dr. Samuel Clarke and Theophilus Lindsay, have done the same, varying as little as possible from the Episcopal form. In all these books, *uniformity* is the object. It has great advantages for the imagination and the heart. It makes the Church above, the Church below, the Church around us, the Church which is to be, of one communion. We repeat the words on which have lifted to God the aspirations and confessions of million hearts, when we repeat these old *Te Deums* and *Litanies*.

The second class of Service-books seeks greater variety, by adding new forms of service to that in use in the Church of England. But each service is arranged for the whole period of worship; so that, if the minister, for example, selects the first service or the second, he must read the one he selects to the end. He cannot combine a part of one with a part of another.

The third class of Service-books is that in which a large number of Litanies, Canticles, Prayers, and Psalms are given, and the minister is left free to combine them at his convenience, for each day. Thus the minister makes a service for each Sunday, longer or shorter, more or less liturgic, more or less responsive, according to the time, the circumstances, the character of the congregation. This last kind of book seems to us best suited to societies like ours, who have not been trained, by long usage, to liturgic forms. It gives a boundless variety. It gives opportunity for a minimum or a maximum of liturgic forms. If the congregation which is assembled is prepared to respond, a service with responses may be chosen; if not, not. Practically, we regard this sort of Office-book the best.

Mr. Martineau's Service-book belongs to the second class. It furnishes ten complete and excellent forms. Then follow Collects for the Christian year. We should object to this part of the book, that these Collects have often no particular adaptation to their days, and that the Christian year is left singularly meagre. *Sixteen* Sundays are characterized simply as the first, second, &c., after Christmas. There is, we imagine, no special religious interest attached to the ninth Sunday after

Christmas, which does not belong to the tenth or eleventh. So we have *twenty-six* Sundays qualified only as the first, second, &c., after Whitsunday. ALL SAINTS' DAY does not appear in "the Christian year," though there is a prayer for "All Saints" in another place. Why not have, in the Christian year, the festivals of the great apostles, Peter, James, John, Paul; the festival of Mary the Mother; one collect for the Magdalen; and others, if you please, for the great doctors, teachers, apostles, missionaries, of the Church; for Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Athanasius; for Luther, Savonarola, Swedenborg, Wesley, Channing; for the Reformation, the Pilgrim Fathers, the conversion of the Germans, &c.?

Mr. and Mrs. Denton's book, called "*The Soul of Things*," is an attempt to carry further Dr. Buchanan's experiments, to which he gave the name of Psychometry. According to these experiments, a letter, held in the hand of a susceptible person, would convey to the mind a very vivid and distinct idea of the character of the writer. The experiments in this book propose to show, that all the objects of nature have received impressions from the past, and contain an experience and history, which can be detected and revealed by persons of proper aptitudes. How far this is true, remains to be verified by further observations. We, at least, are not at present prepared to affirm or deny any thing concerning it.

Mr. Higginson's "*Out-door Papers*" is a very proper companion-volume for Winthrop's "*Life in the Open Air*." They are written with great spirit, beauty, and power.

Mr. Orr's book treats in a large way, and with few minutiae, of modern Unitarianism; and may be considered as a supplement, from a mere transcendental point of view, of Dr. Ellis's "*Fifty Years of Unitarian Controversy*."

"*Substance and Shadow*," by Mr. James, is a highly metaphysical book on a highly practical theme, with a very experimental basis and a very religious purport. Mr. James adopts too much the bullying style of rhetoric, and so repels readers of taste from considering the important questions he has to discuss. He deals much in paradox. His aim, as in other of his books, is to denounce the moral law, to show the fallacy of merit, the emptiness of virtue so called: therefore the same aim as that of Paul, Augustine, Luther, and all those who have preached justification by faith; but not the same aim as Swedenborg, whom he, nevertheless, takes singularly enough for his patron and master.

The little book, "*Woman and her Saviour in Persia*," is a very interesting contribution to the history of Christian missions.

The state of the Nestorian Christians is amply illustrated, and many touching anecdotes are related of individuals. Perhaps these missions attempt too much the reproduction of the New-England type of Calvinism, a type by no means adapted to the Asiatic mind. Still, the success of those earnest and devoted laborers was great; and they have reason to thank God for the good given them to do for him.

MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

July 13, 1863. — Present, Messrs. Stebbins, Hedge, Clarke, Brigham, Newell, Barrett, Hinckley, Sawyer, Norton, Smith, and Fox.

The Committee on New-England Correspondence presented a letter from Rev. A. D. Wheeler, D.D., of Brunswick, Me., asking aid for his society; and, in accordance with their recommendation, an appropriation was made, for the present year, of \$100.

The same Committee also presented an application for aid from the society in Sudbury, Mass.; but stated that all the information required in such cases had not been given. The Secretary was therefore instructed to notify the society of this fact; and the Committee were authorized, should the information when furnished prove satisfactory, to pay to them the sum of \$50.

In compliance with the request of the society in San Francisco, Cal., the Treasurer was directed to pay \$400, from their recent contribution, to the society at Yonkers, N.Y.

The President read portions of a letter recently received from Rev. William G. Scandlin, in which he stated that he could see but little chance of continuing his missionary labors longer than through July, — which would close the three months for which he was appointed, — on account of the necessity of then returning to his parish.

After a general expression of opinion as to the great value of Mr. Scandlin's services, a vote was unanimously adopted, stating that, in the judgment of the Board, it was of the utmost importance he should continue longer in his present work.

A Standing Committee of three, on Army Missions, was then appointed, to take charge of all matters connected with that department; and they were instructed to make, if possible, some arrangement by which Mr. Scandlin should be retained as the army missionary of the Association. Messrs. Stebbins, Ware, and Sawyer were chosen as members of this Committee.

An application from Rev. Samuel J. May, for books for a society at Memphis, N.Y., was referred to the Committee on Publications and the Secretary, with full powers.

The salary of the Secretary, which was referred to the Board by the Association at their annual meeting, was fixed at \$1,400.

After the transaction of other business, the Board adjourned.

Aug. 13. — Present, Messrs. Stebbins, Barrett, Hinckley, Sawyer, Smith, and Fox.

The Committee on Western Correspondence presented an application for aid, from M. De Lange, Esq., in behalf of the society in Pittsburg, Penn.; and the Treasurer was authorized to pay to them \$100, the amount asked for, should the usual questions be answered to the satisfaction of the Committee.

In compliance with the request of the Board of Instruction of the Meadville Theological School, an appropriation of \$100 was made towards the support, the present year, of the preparatory department in that institution.

The Committee on Publications reported that the edition of a thousand copies of "The Soldier's Manual of Devo-

tion," authorized by the vote of May 11, had been published at St. Louis, under the direction of the author; but that, as he had added twenty-four pages of new matter, the expense had been somewhat greater than the vote provided for. As the additions to the work met with the approval of the Board, an appropriation was made sufficient to cover the whole cost of the edition.

Authority was given to the Committee on Publications, to print, with money belonging to the Army Fund, any new tracts for soldiers, which they might approve.

The Committee on Army Missions reported that some action was required concerning the salary of Mr. Scandlin, as the three months for which he was appointed had expired, and he was still a prisoner at Richmond.

It was then voted, that, so long as Mr. Scandlin remained in the hands of the rebels, his salary should be continued, and should be payable to his wife.

Other business was transacted; and then the Board adjourned to Monday, Sept. 14.

INTELLIGENCE.

Mr. JOHN B. BEACH, a graduate of the Meadville Theological School in the class of 1861, who has had charge of the society in Austinburg, Ohio, for the past year, was ordained as its pastor on Sunday, June 21. The order of services was as follows: Introductory prayer, and reading of the Scriptures, by Rev. S. B. Flagg, of Kalamazoo, Mich.; sermon, and prayer of consecration, by Rev. George W. Hosmer, D.D., of Buffalo, N.Y.; charge to the candidate, and address to the people, by Rev. Carlton A. Staples, of Milwaukee, Wis.; right hand of fellowship, by Rev. S. B. Flagg; concluding prayer, by Rev. A. G. Hibbard, of Aurora, Ill.; benediction, by the pastor.

Rev. JOHN K. KARCHER, formerly of Toronto, Can., has accepted a call from the society in Nantucket, Mass.

The ELEVENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE of the Western Unitarian Churches was held at Toledo, Ohio; commencing on Wednesday, June 17, and continuing through the four following days. The officers elected for the ensuing year were as follows: President, Rev. George W. Hosmer, D.D., of Buffalo, N.Y. Vice-Presidents, Adam Elder, Esq., of Detroit, Mich.; and Samuel Greely, Esq., of Chicago, Ill. Corresponding Secretary, Rev. Martin W. Willis, of Quincy, Ill. Recording Secretary, Rev. Sylvan S. Hunting, of Detroit, Mich. Treasurer, B. F. Stamm, Esq., of Detroit. Executive Committee, Rev. A. D. Mayo, of Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. Robert Collyer, of Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Carlton A. Staples, of Milwaukee, Wis.; Rev. Richard Metcalf, of Meadville, Penn.; and Rev. John H. Heywood, of Louisville, Ky.

The ANNIVERSARY EXERCISES of the Meadville Theological School were celebrated on Thursday, June 25. The following essays were read by the graduating class: The Prophet and the Statesman, by Mr. Francis E. Abbot, of Boston, Mass.; the Church of a Free People, by Mr. George Batchelor, of New Bedford, Mass.; the Truth conquers through Sacrifice, by Mr. Stephen H. Camp, of Rochester, N.Y.; Intuition and Logic as related to Faith, by Mr. Everett Finley, of Springfield, Ohio; Reform in Theology, by Mr. Allen O. Fuller, of Warren, Ohio.

On Thursday afternoon, Mr. Stephen H. Camp, who had accepted the chaplaincy of a colored regiment, was ordained to the work of the Christian ministry at the Unitarian Church. The order of services was as follows: Invocation, by Rev. William L. Chaffin, of Philadelphia; reading of the Scriptures, by Prof. George L. Cary, of Meadville; sermon, by Rev. Nahor A. Staples, of Brooklyn, N.Y.; ordaining prayer, by Rev. George W. Hosmer, D.D., of Buffalo, N.Y.; charge, by Rev. Richard Metcalf, of Meadville; right hand of fellowship, by Rev. Carlton A. Staples, of Milwaukee, Wis.

Rev. CHARLES G. AMES, formerly of Bloomington, Ill., has accepted a call from the society in Albany, N.Y.

The UNITARIAN CHURCHES OF MAINE held a convention, for preaching, conference, and prayer, at Farmington, in that State, on Tuesday and Wednesday, July 7 and 8.

The ANNUAL VISITATION of the Cambridge Divinity School occurred on Tuesday, July 14. The essays read by the graduating class were as follows: The Influence of the Monastic Orders, by Mr. William Brown, of Concord, Mass.; the Unwritten History of Christ, by Mr. Charles A. Humphreys, of Dorchester, Mass.; Dogma, Ritual, and Practical Philanthropy, as Bases of Christian Union, by Mr. Milton J. Miller, of Springfield, Ohio; the Everlasting Gospel, by Mr. David H. Montgomery, of Syracuse, N.Y.; the Word of God not Bound, by Mr. Israel F. Williams, of Taunton, Mass.; the Religious Experiences of Martin Luther, by Mr. William W. Newell, of Cambridge, Mass. — Previous to the Visitation, Mr. Charles A. Humphreys, of the graduating class, who had been appointed chaplain of the Second Regiment Massachusetts Cavalry, was ordained to that work, at Divinity-Hall Chapel. The order of services was as follows: Introductory prayer, and reading of the Scriptures, by Rev. George L. Chaney, of Boston; ordaining prayer, by Rev. George R. Noyes, D.D., of Cambridge; charge, by Rev. John F. W. Ware, of Cambridgeport; right hand of fellowship, by Rev. Ed. H. Hall, of Plymouth; hymn.

Rev. ROBERT MOORE has resigned the charge of the society in Keokuk, Io.

Rev. LIVINGSTON STONE has accepted an invitation to take charge of the society in Charlestown, N.H., for one year.

Rev. WILLIAM B. SMITH has resigned the charge of the society in Fall River, Mass.

The following Unitarian clergymen have been drafted: Rev. Benjamin H. Bailey of Dedham; Rev. Daniel Bowen of Hingham; Rev. Caleb Davis Bradlee of Roxbury; Rev. Charles H. Brigham of Taunton; Rev. Charles W. Buck of Boston; Rev. Charles Bugbee of Ashby; Rev. Moncure D. Conway of Concord; Rev. Henry W. Foote of Boston; Rev. T. B. Forbush of West Roxbury; Rev. Ed. C. Guild of Canton; Rev. Augustus M. Haskell of Salem; Rev. Caleb B. Josselyn of Malden; Rev. Calvin S. Locke of West Dedham; Rev. Charles Lowe of Somerville; Rev. Sidney H. Morse of Cambridge; Rev. Charles Noyes of Brighton; Rev. William J. Potter of New Bedford; Rev. James Sallaway of Billerica; Rev. Loammi G. Ware of

Boston; Rev. Charles B. Webster of Neponset; Rev. Ed. I. Galvin of Brookfield; Rev. Eugene De Normandie of Littleton; Rev. William L. Chaffin of Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. C. C. Everett of Bangor, Me.

Rev. ABIEL A. LIVERMORE, having been appointed President of the Meadville Theological School, has accepted the office, and will enter upon his duties at the commencement of the next term.

Rev. WILLIAM G. SCANDLIN, the missionary of the American Unitarian Association to the Army of the Potomac, was taken prisoner by the rebels, near Emmitsburg, Md., July 5. When captured, he was in company with Dr. Alexander McDonald, an agent of the Sanitary Commission, and had charge with him of a wagon-load of goods belonging to the Commission, which were intended for the hospitals at Gettysburg. Mr. Scandlin was last heard from July 21, when he was confined in the Libby Prison at Richmond, but was in a thoroughly ventilated room, was well treated, and hoped very soon to be unconditionally released.

 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

1863.			
June 17.	From	Society in Waltham, as a donation, additional	\$3.00
" 22.	"	Rev. Frederic Huidekoper, for books	33.37
" 23.	"	Society in Sherborn, for Monthly Journals . .	13.00
" "	"	Rev. F. A. Farley, D.D., Trustee, as income of Graham Fund	286.27
" 25.	"	Rev. T. S. King's Society, San Francisco, Cal., as a donation	1,000.00
" 29.	"	Society in Newport, R.I., for Monthly Journals	40.00
" "	"	" " Medfield, for Monthly Journals, ad- ditional	5.00
" 30.	"	Mount-Pleasant Society, Roxbury, for Monthly Journals, additional.	3.00
July 2.	"	Miss Lydia S. Gale, to make herself a life- member	30.00
" "	"	W. H. Brooks, as a donation, including \$1 to make himself an annual member	5.00
" 3.	"	Rev. W. H. Knapp, as a donation	1.00
" 6.	"	Joseph Winsor, to make himself an annual member	1.00
" 7.	"	a friend, for Madras Mission	1.00

July 9.	From Rev. F. A. Farley, D.D., Trustee, as income of Graham Fund	\$28.00
" "	" Society in New Bedford, as a donation	200.00
" "	" Rev. Dr. Ellis's Society, Charlestown, for Monthly Journals	58.00
" 11.	" Rev. J. K. Karcher, to make himself an annual member	1.00
" "	" Society in Somerville, for Monthly Journals, additional	1.00
" 13.	" Society in Dublin, N.H., as a donation, including \$5 to complete life-membership of Jonathan K. Smith, and also annual memberships of D. Mason, Mrs. J. Greenwood, D. Fiske, J. Piper, R. Piper, and I. Adams . \$15.00	
	For Army Fund	2.00
	" Monthly Journals	4.50
		21.50
" 17.	" Society in Stow, for Monthly Journals	7.00
" "	" Rev. Nathaniel Hall's Society, Dorchester, for Monthly Journals, additional	1.00
" 18.	" "Benevolent Circle" of Society in Littleton, to make Deacon John M. Hartwell a life-member	30.00
" 20.	" Philemon Putnam, as a donation	5.00
" 24.	" a member of the Arlington-street Society, Boston, as a donation	50.00
" "	" Rev. T. C. Adam, to make himself an annual member	1.00
" 25.	" Society in Bangor, Me., for Monthly Journals \$75.00	
	For Army Fund	25.00
		100.00
" "	" Rev. S. B. Stewart, to make himself an annual member	1.00
" 30.	" Society in Framingham, as a donation	30.00
Aug. 4.	" " East Bridgewater, as a donation	25.85
" 7.	" " Toronto, C.W., for India Mission	12.70
" 8.	" Edward E. Bourne, Kennebunk, Me., to make his wife, Susan H. Bourne, a life-member	30.00
" "	" Susan H. Bourne, to make her husband, Edward E. Bourne, a life-member	30.00
" 13.	" Rev. S. W. M'Daniel, to make himself an annual member	1.00

ARMY FUND.

June 2.	From L. S. G., for circulating tracts	\$10.00
July 6.	" Rev. William Mountford	10.00
" "	" a friend, towards support of Rev. William G. Scandlin	100.00
" 11.	" a friend in Maine	3.00
" 13.	" Society in Dublin, N. H. (acknowledged above)	2.00
" 25.	" Society in Bangor, Me. (acknowledged above)	25.00
" 30.	" a friend	1.00
Aug. 13.	" Society in Westford	15.26